

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE
LAW DEPARTMENT

E U I W O R K I N G P A P E R N o 85/157

NIKLAS LUHMANN ON THE WELFARE
STATE AND ITS LAW

by

Gianfranco Poggi

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO, FIRENZE

Not to be quoted without
the prior permission of
the author.

© Gianfranco Poggi
Printed in Italy in March 1985
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico (FI)

NIKLAS LUHMANN ON THE WELFARE STATE AND ITS LAW

by Gianfranco Poggi (University of Edinburgh)

Introduction

This paper is intended exclusively as an elementary, summary presentation of its topic. On two grounds do I consider such a modest task worth performing. In the first place, although this situation is now rapidly changing (1), Luhmann is far less known to students who read only English than to those who can read German (or Italian); besides, few of his writings in English expound his sociology of law (2), and none (as far I know) address directly and at length the specific theme of this paper. In the second place, Luhmann is a complex and demanding writer, and those not yet familiar with him can probably be helped, in making their first acquaintance, by the kind of introduction attempted here (3).

I

This first section of the paper deals exclusively with a single text, Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat (Luhmann, 1981a) - a short book written by Luhmann, I believe, at the behest of a German political party, and thus addressed originally to a non-specialist audience. In spite or because of this, this

text dispenses with any extensive description of the welfare state phenomenon. Luhmann does say that the phenomenon amounts to more than what Italians refer to as the "stato assistenziale" - a complex of public operations intended to relieve the economic disadvantage of underprivileged groups - but he is unfortunately unclear as to what else it amounts to. In particular, it is not clear whether the imagery of the welfare state adopted throughout the book does or does not comprise various forms of public intervention in the management of the national economy, from the support of aggregate demand to the financing of corporate Research and Development expenditures - forms which, according to some writers, constitute something like "welfare for the rich", insofar as they contribute to capital accumulation. (The omission of any explicit consideration of such state activities matches Luhmann's total, contemptuous lack of attention to marxist views of the welfare state, some of which emphasise precisely those activities).

Against the background, then, of an inadequate descriptive treatment of the welfare state, Luhmann proceeds to the much more congenial task of a theoretical treatment of it. Essentially, within the societies in which the welfare state operates, he seeks to identify a "principle" - a broad developmental tendency under whose logic those operations themselves might be meaningfully subsumed. In the light of this criterion, he discards proposals advanced by others: neither the principle of solidarity nor that of the moderation

of social disadvantage appear to him capable of bearing the conceptual weight required. He accords greater significance to a further principle, that of compensation; but essentially his own argument advances an alternative solution, according to which it is the principle of inclusion that makes the best conceptual sense of the development of the welfare state (4).

In order to realise what Luhmann means by "inclusion" we must consider, however briefly, his treatment of a wider problem, utterly central to his whole theoretical enterprise (5): the problem of the distinctive nature of modern society. For quite a few years now, Luhmann has addressed that problem chiefly by conceptualising an evolutionary sequence in the arrangements whereby broader, more comprehensive social systems (= societies) are on the one hand differentiated into narrower subsystems, and on the other sustain their own identity through those subsystems' operations.

First in this sequence (see for instance Luhmann, 1982:242 ff.) come societies characterised by segmentary differentiation: here the subsystems are very similar to one another and largely self-sufficient; they only make up a broader, societal system insofar as they share a cultural patrimony; metaphorically, we might say that such ("primitive") societies are integrated by virtue of possessing a centre. The next step in the sequence (hierarchical differentiation) concerns societies whose characteristic subsystems are corporate bodies standing in relations of superiority/inferiority toward one another, and

where the superordinate bodies impose their own dominance over the subordinate ones; metaphorically, such stratified societies may be said to be integrated by virtue of having a summit. In the final arrangement, characteristic of modern societies (functional differentiation) the key subsystems are no longer "lived-in", "manned", relatively concrete social entities, but much more abstract ones: they consist of sets of differentiated, specialised resources and activities (political, economic, religious, legal, etc.) each of which presuppose the operation of the others and concurs through its own to the functioning of the whole. Such a society cannot be said, even metaphorically, to possess either centre or summit; it represents a distinctive "evolutionary advance" because of its capacity to generate and to make use of much greater complexity than societies characterised by the two earlier patterns of differentiation/integration.

Functional differentiation deeply alters the relationship between individuals and differentiated subsystems (and, through them, the larger society). Under premodern conditions, as we have seen, those subsystems (both the isolated, local communities of "primitive" societies; and the strata constituting more advanced ones) were units in which individuals lived out their concrete existence and from which they unproblematically derived their identities. The subsystems of modern societies are, as I have said, abstract entities: their own components are not individuals as such, but "roles", differentiated aspects and phases of the concrete

existence of individuals, who are involved in those subsystems only with reference to specific capacities and concerns. This makes the modern relationship between individuals and the larger society particularly problematic, since the latter only exists through the operation of its functionally differentiated subsystems. The "inclusion principle", to which Luhmann chiefly refers for a theoretical understanding of the development of the welfare state, formulates the main tendency associated with the advance of modernity in shaping that relationship:

As an individual, man lives outside the functional systems. At the same time, each person must have access to each functional system, to the extent that the person cannot conduct his existence without addressing claims to societal functions. The inclusion principle formulates this requirement from the standpoint of the societal system (1981a:27f.)

Concretely, the principle's realisation is associated with the building up of the modern state and its evolving relationship to the population. At first that relationship concerns mainly the state's jurisdictional activity: individuals as such become vested with generalised legal capacities and all become justiciable of the state. Later, the expanding fiscal and legislative prerogatives of the state are brought to bear on the population at large, and democratic participation rights are associated with this expansion. This development culminates in

the "encompassing of an ever-growing range of needs and interests of the population within the domain of possible political themes" (1981a:28) through the building up of the welfare state which thus represents "the implementation of political inclusion" (1981a:28).

This is, however, a dynamic implementation, driven forward to ever new targets, as the welfare state secures the individual's access to more and more aspects and phases of the societal process. This dynamic tendency is interpreted by Luhmann in two ways. He connects it in the first place with a generic feature of social (and perhaps other) systems, which he labels as "self-reference":

The demand for welfare can refer always to itself and call itself "welfare". 'Welfare is of unlimited scope'. It possesses no end, can itself undertake the production of its own possibilities and of its own problems (1981a:36 f.).

In the second place, Luhmann connects this dynamic tendency to the changing pattern of internal differentiation of the functionally differentiated political system. In the early modern period that pattern was dualistic; it replicated at all levels from the system's top down to its base, the asymmetry characteristic of command/obedience relations between parts characterised at each level as respectively super- or sub-ordinate. The later, properly modern pattern, however

(which still holds in contemporary societies), is instead triadic. Here, the key differentiated subsystems of the political system are indeed three: the public, politics in the narrow sense (that is, the party system); administration (nota bene: this term to Luhmann denotes both legislative and governmental activities); and the (power) relations between these subsystems are not symmetric but circular. Power does not flow downwards but circulates backwards and forwards between those subsystems and, according to Luhmann, its movements trace two power circuits. Within one circuit, as conventional constitutional theory describes it, parliament (as the institutional seat of politics in the narrow sense) "makes laws and grants means for the pursuit of goals; the executive carries out programmes worked out through politics; the public abides by the decisions thus formed and in turn elects parliament". There is however a countercircuit, where

the administration puts preformed decisions in front of politics. Through party organisations, politics suggests to the public what it should vote for and why. In turn, the public influences the administration through channels as various as, on one hand interest groups and on the other, people bursting into tears in public offices. (1981a:45 f.).

According to Luhmann, the welfare state's expansive tendencies rest particularly on this second counter-circuit, and particularly on the interface between the public (with its ever

present demand for state action regarding its needs) and the administration (with its potentially expandible capacity for intervention according to that demand).

The reader will have noted that so far my account (which closely follows Luhman's text) has made no mention of law. This is consistent with Luhmann's general view of modern society: for here law figures not as part of the political system, but as another differentiated societal subsystem, parallel with the political system itself, religion, education, the economy. Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat introduces law through a rather tortuous argument, the elucidation of which calls for a brief reconsideration of two (overlapping) notions already mentioned: internal differentiation, and self-reference.

Each differentiated subsystem of a larger system becomes in turn differentiated and its tendency to self-reference takes the form of focussing much of its activity on the relations between its own differentiated (sub)subsystems, rather than on its own relations with the original larger system. Somewhat more concretely, this means that although the political system is a differentiated subsystem of society, most political activity tends to become concerned with internal political matters, and particularly with the contingencies of the power exchanges taking place along the circuit and countercircuit discussed above.

This tendency, however, is counteracted at various points, corresponding to the interfaces between each pair within the triad of components we have mentioned, by "externalisations". This is to say that (so far as I understand Luhmann on this difficult point) the components of each pair are kept from becoming exclusively absorbed in their reciprocal relations by having to take account of the demands made by other societal subsystems, which in a sense remind them of the existence of a wider environment. In the present context, Luhmann introduces law as one such "externalisation device", affecting specifically the public/administration interface. For while law itself, under modern conditions, is formed through legislation and thus "rests on the political system", yet "specific activities within the public/administration relationship presuppose law as an external fact binding both sides" (1981a:64). The law's impact on that relationship is multiple; for instance, reference to law excludes public and administration from either colliding or colluding with one another solely in terms of their contrasting or converging interests and of the respective quantum of power. Law, more particularly, constrains administrative activity by requiring that equal cases should receive equal treatment; its existence makes it more likely that citizens will cooperate or comply with the administration's activities willingly (rather than under compulsion).

Further references to law are made in the context of a major theme of Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat - that of "the

limits of the welfare state". Once more, Luhmann attacks this theme by introducing a wider theoretical notion: the distinction between the function the political (sub)system performs for the societal system as a whole, and the specific performances demanded of it on behalf of the other (sub)systems - especially the economy, education, science, and the health system. Concretely, the political system is being asked to make provision for (some) requirements of all those other systems in the interest of (finally) increasing the population's welfare by guaranteeing the inclusion of more and more of its members among those benefitting from these systems' activities. However, the political system also remains bound to its specialised functional concern with "securing the execution of binding decisions" (Bereitstellung der Durchsetzungsfähigkeit fuer bindende Entscheidungen) (1981a:82), by means of disposition over power and ultimately over physical coercion.

Now, according to Luhmann, this abiding concern of the state limits the extent to which it can reasonably be expected to deliver all of the performances expected of it by the other societal (sub)systems. For, as it seeks to meet the latter's demands, the state can only make recourse to two key "operative instrumentalities" (1981a: ch. XIII) which are compatible with the functional destination: it can allocate money - it can produce and arrange for the implementation of law. Money and law constitute, in this context of analysis, the two basic media of communication through which the bindingness of

political decisions can be secured.

Considered as such media, both money and law present considerable advantages. For instance, they are relatively easily deployable on the part of the political centre; they can be used to form lengthy chains of operation (as original allocations of money become a sequence of sub-allocations, and as broader legal directives become specified into narrower and narrower rulings); they can be used to build organisations, specialised agencies. However, there also are difficulties in the use of money and law as means (specifically) of the state's welfare activities. One may classify the most significant of these difficulties under the following three labels:

- disadvantages. The formation of laws and the allocation of moneys, when they constitute and are seen as the object of decisions, tend to enhance the sensitivity to changes both of those benefitting from and (critically) of those negatively affected by these decisions:

increases or decreases in available moneys, such as one would not normally notice become noticeable when effected through decisions; equally, changes in one's legal position which normally one would not observe are acutely perceived when enacted through decisions. (1981a:96).

Thus, both legal and financial provisions made in the context of welfare state activities tend to produce, at best, what Raymond Aron once labelled a "satisfaction querelleuse".

- intrinsic limitations. There are "advanced" forms of welfare activity, particularly those labelled in the U.S.A. "people processing", that intend to induce or restore in their addressees a sense of personal worth, a capacity for autonomy and responsibility, whose beneficial effects simply cannot be secured (at any rate directly) through either legal or financial provisions:

Activities in this realm require resources of commitment, personal involvement, interactional sensibility, which law and money cannot provide for ... The conditions for success or failure, here rest on the individuals themselves and their interaction systems: these cannot be controlled from the centre or reduced to legal obligations ... (... What cannot be accomplished by means of either law or money is the modification of the people themselves) (1981a:97).

- cost. This difficulty must be understood, broadly, as the probability that the extensive recourse by the state to money allocations and legal provisions may overload, respectively, a society's economic system and its legal system:

In both domains, it should not be forgotten that ultimately the conditions of the possibility of these instrumentalities must be guaranteed outside the political system, and that this limits their availability to that system (1981a:99).

In this context, Luhmann refers critically to a contemporary

tendency - labelled in Germany Verrechtlichung (which is translated - clumsily - as 'juridification') to legally discipline relationships and processes which in the past have dispensed with such discipline.

The welfare state may seek to evade or moderate the difficulties listed above, and pertaining to the direct employment of money and law as media of communication, by the strategy of using them indirectly to establish and finance administrative agencies which will in turn engage in non-financial and non-legal forms of intervention (for instance, through professional "caring" activities). But this strategy has its own pitfalls. In the first place, it unavoidably involves the further expansion of the state's administrative apparatus, with all the attendant bureaucratic pathologies. Furthermore, sometimes the agencies themselves, even when staffed by appropriately qualified personnel, run up against the same difficulty as the state's direct use of law and money (and particularly those labelled above "intrinsic limitations"). Finally, it often leads to the agency-building efforts being mistaken for indications of the agencies' effective incidence upon the "welfare problems" entrusted to them.

These liabilities of the state's most distinctive "operational instrumentalities", when deployed in the context of an expanded and expansive conception of welfare (together with other critical considerations) lead Luhmann to suggest the wisdom of

adopting instead a more restrictive conception. The argument developed to this effect in Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat is interesting in its own right; but for the purposes of the present topic this book has no more to offer; we shall take our leave of it at this point, and look for other relevant texts.

II

It may be seen from the above account that Politische Theorie does indeed deal with law, but in a rather undifferentiated fashion, without any close analysis of the specific legal phenomena involved in or affected by the state's welfare activities. I know of no further texts of Luhmann's which engage expressly and at length in such an analysis. But there are a few which raise, incidentally to other topics, the question of "law in the welfare state".

The most important of these is a lengthy essay (Luhmann, 1981c:ch. 2) in which where Luhmann, building upon two earlier essays (Luhmann, 1969, Luhmann 1970a; now reprinted in Luhmann 1981b: 273 ff, 360 ff.), discusses "Subjective rights: the reconstruction of juridical consciousness on behalf of modern society". Once more (as the title suggests) the essay's broader topic is the nature of modern society. Specifically, it investigates one major legal development connected with the transition from hierarchical to functional differentiation, and

with the associated increased significance of "self-reference" as a mechanism for the production of social and cultural reality. That is: in the same way that in Descartes's cogito the subject's reference to himself becomes the ground of cognitive certainty, in the legal sphere subjectively becomes the ground of a distinctively modern phenomenon - subjective rights (Luhmann quotes Saleilles's je veux, donc j'ai des droits).

The modernity of the notion of subjective rights appears if we contrast it with the premodern notion of jus which it replaces. Jus entailed not only the complementarity of juridically protected expectations (i.e.: to the rights of one side correspond the obligations of the other) but also reciprocity (i.e.: there are rights and obligations in capo a both sides, though rarely an equivalence in the balance of rights over obligations on each side). However, the modern notion of subjective rights settles for complementarity: each subject may hold protected expectations via-a-vis others which are not directly connected or commensurate with the former's obligations toward the latter. These, furthermore, are mostly called upon simply to register rather than act upon a given subject's rights.

Thus substracted from a concrete context of mutual obligations, juridically protected expectations become more mobile and fluid; they can be more freely generated, more variously combined, more open-endedly shifted in the intercourse among

subjects holding them. One might say that subjective rights stand to jus as money exchange stands to barter: they presuppose and sustain a much more complex and flexible universe of expectations and potentialities. Not being counterbalanced by reciprocities, they also allow much greater asymmetries to build up in their actual enjoyment among subjects. The control over protected expectations, in turn, becomes much more abstract, detached, and general as, with the progressive modernisation of law, it comes to rest more and more upon enacted laws of the state and the latter's monopoly of legitimate enforcement. On the other hand, it is precisely the fastening upon subjects-as-such (as loci of self-referential processes) of entitlements in the form of rights that diminishes some risks attendant upon the positivisation of law.

What then - one may ask - is the connection between this legal development and the welfare state? That connection is complex and, so to speak, ambivalent. To begin with, subjective rights can be seen as ways of securing the "inclusion principle" which, as we have seen, Luhmann sees as central to the welfare state phenomenon. "Subjective right symbolises man outside the differentiated systems with his claims to inclusion" (1981c:98). More precisely, (developing an insight first developed by Simmel): Luhmann says that under modern conditions each individual becomes more loosely connected with a greater number of differentiated contexts

the inclusion of the population in the societal system must be brought about in new forms. And since at first this aspiration cannot yet be realised, it becomes vested in the form of subjective rights. The fact that one is dealing with subjective rights (rather than sheer reflections of an objective legal order) symbolises that individuals are now seen as more strongly individualised and more independent of specific social connections. The fact that one is dealing with subjective rights (rather than obligations and responsibilities) symbolises that the inclusion of every individual in all functional domains is still an unfulfilled aspiration (1981c:84 f.).

Thus, the welfare state realises its programme "largely by means of an immense number of newly created subjective rights, transforming into entitlements not all but many social performances" (Leistungen). This development is compatible with the principle of functional differentiation, for it does not closely connect reciprocities with rights (Luhmann criticizes the famous formulation of the Weimar constitution, Eigentum verpflichtet, as an anachronistic attempt to make such a connection). Rather, subjective right remains "a matter of subjective arbitrium, founded upon itself and presupposing on the part of others only the complementary registering" (Erleben) of one's entitlements (1981c:89).

However - unlike the paradigmatic subjective right, property - each subjective right associated with the expansion of the

welfare state tends to become "hedged in by multiple regulations" (1981c:88), to the point where the determination of the concrete significance of the right is no longer vested in its holder but in the state itself as the right's addressee, which formulates the conditions for the realisation of the right in the context of its own operations and requirements.

In the long run, this leads to a veritable inversion of the relationship between "acting" and "registering" which was typical of earlier, "non-welfare" rights. There, most of the acting, if any was the business of the right-holder and other parties merely registered it. The typical welfare right, however, shifts the locus of action toward the state, putting the right-holder into the position of a claimant for the benefit of the state's action, or even just its passive recipient. Thus, while originally subjective rights had served to decentralise the production of legal phenomena and acted as a counterweight to positive law, welfare subjective rights become themselves "an instrumentality of positive law" (1981c:88). Furthermore, the very idea of subjectivity as a self-referential quality of the individual on which his/her right was grounded becomes attenuated, as the individual comes to be seen as the titular of interests rather than as the locus of subjectivity.

This last development contaminates the general notion of subjective rights, even outside the context of the welfare state:

Recent private law doctrine characterises subjective rights as the 'assignment' (Zuweisung) of goods or opportunities, and thus thinks itself in agreement with the constitutional concept of person and the Wuerdegebot. But read your Kant, and you realise that the opposite is taking place. For, according to Kant, subjective rights do not 'assign' but merely 'secure' what pertains to the subject in and of himself (was dem Subjekt von sich aus zusteht). This 'in and of himself' has now been dropped, and replaced by the appeal to 'fundamental values' with which the legislator must comply while doing his 'assigning' (1981c:91).

In other terms: law is no longer seen as acknowledging and protecting rights which possess an "inner side" of their own. Rather, it becomes the sole fount and ground of rights deprived of any such independent foundation. This development may entail a "threat to human freedom", and by untying legal development from any presuppositions allows it to "go on growing out of control" (1981c:92).

III

The previous section dealt with legal developments associated with the welfare state which affect individual entitlements. One might expect Luhmann to complement his consideration of such developments with arguments concerning the legal aspects

of the activation and control of state agencies involved in welfare tasks, and in particularly changes in the nature of administrative law. In fact, so far as I know, Luhmann has not discussed the latter topic at length. There is something suprising about this, given the fact that before entering his academic career Luhmann worked as a civil servant, and has since clearly indicated in a number of essays (see especially Luhmann 1971) his command of the specialist knowledge required to address that topic. In my view, however, the fact that he has so far failed to address it is not accidental, but expresses what one may call a grounded reluctance, and can be made sense of in the light of following considerations:

a) Luhmann has recently insisted on the distinction between three fundamental levels at which social systems are formed and operate: the interactional; organisational; and societal level. Law, in his view, develops and functions primarily at the last, societal level. For reasons indicated above, however, the performance of welfare activities is increasingly the concern of agencies operating more and more as organisations, which to that extent are not as likely to constitute the foci of specifically legal developments as the "classical" state organs were.

b) It is true of course that the structure of such agencies is the proper concern of legislation. However

- Luhmann seems to think that by and large existent administrative structures, particularly in the German Federal

Republic are adequate (1981a:115); and, in any case,

- the legislative decisions concerning those structures are, strictly speaking, matters of policy, and as such not the object of specifically juridical argument.

c) As to the operations of those agencies, these generally take the form of "programmed decisions". Luhmann distinguishes two kinds of programmes:

- conditional programmes. These state certain conditions, the occurrence of which bindingly commits agencies to certain prearranged lines of activity.
- purposive programmes. These assign to agencies a given task or goal, leaving them largely free to seek the means most conducive to its realisation.

Now, only conditional programmes are specifically amenable to close juridical orientation and control, and require agencies to engage in that specific form of juridical reasoning which consists in matching abstractly stated conditions with the factual situations (Tatbestaende) at hand. However, such programmes (with which much of traditional administrative law is concerned) are, according to Luhmann, increasingly unsuitable for the orientation and control of administrative activity in a complex, changing environment. But welfare state activities are increasingly of the latter kind, and accordingly require purposive programmes; this makes them relatively resistant to juridical discipline (at any rate of a traditional nature).

d) Besides "conditional programmes", much administrative law sets up detailed Verfahren, (decisional procedures). According to Luhmann, the key function of Verfahren is that of imparting legitimacy to decisions. In his view, however, modern political systems - at any rate those constituted as liberal democracies - entrust the task of legitimation mainly to the spheres of politics and legislation (which perform them respectively through the electoral and legislative Verfahren). Thus the administration ought to be able to proceed with its own activity without much concern for legitimating it (Luhmann, 1975b:ch. 4). This seems to me an argument (however implicit) for loosening up many of the legal restraints traditionally placed upon the administration, leaving it free to develop and execute "purposive programmes" which in turn are, as suggested above, relatively free from legal regulation.

e) Luhmann forthrightly opposes the prospect, cherished by others, of modifying the traditional forms of juridical thinking and training by integrating them with conceptual resources and research strategies drawn from the social sciences (Luhmann, 1969; Luhmann, 1973). "Classical" juridical thinking has a rationality of its own, focussed on the attachment of correct qualifications to past events, the determination of responsibility for past acts, and the application of the resulting sanctions. Such a rationality is at root incompatible with one aimed primarily at the production of future effects; at the determination and control of the factual (as against normative) consequences of decisions. The attempt to mix these

two rationalities would compromise the rigour and distinctiveness of each, and constitute a form of de-differentiation. Instead, modern social sciences should be juxtaposed to legal studies in the training of administrative personnel, and the respective orientations should concur in orienting administrative action. But in this inter-disciplinary programme, the specific content of legal studies would remain fairly traditional (Luhmann, 1970b:73); and they would hold a decreasingly significant position with respect to the programme's other components.

f) At bottom, what for Luhmann (as I read him) essentially disqualifies law from playing a critical role in activating and controlling the ever-expanding activities of public agencies, is the fact that contemporary society requires cognitive expectations rather than normative ones, to play the decisive role in orienting the social process (Luhmann, 1975a:51 ff.). Law itself, of course, forms the object of sustained and sophisticated cognitive efforts, resulting in knowledge which can be systematised, taught, examined, rationally argued about. Yet when all is said and done such knowledge refers to expectations of a normative nature: that is, expectations, the frustration of which by the course of events does not lead to these expectations being abandoned or modified, but to their being held contrafactually and reasserted by means of sanction (Luhmann, 1972:40 ff.). It is their ultimate foundation on a refusal to learn that condemns bodies of normative expectations to play a recessive role in an increasingly complex and changing society. The significance of the related systems of knowledge (including

juridical knowledge) is accordingly reduced.

Insofar as these several considerations constitute a plausible (though admittedly selective, and only partially substantiated) rendering of Luhmann's views about law, their bearing on this paper's topic seems clear. For Luhmann, administrative action (including that which performs the state's multiple welfare tasks) must increasingly take place in a juridical vacuum. One might go as far as saying that, at least for administrative law the ultimate import of Luhmann's thinking on that topic is a kind of Abschied vom Recht - leave-taking from law.

I am aware of the contrasting view argued by Teubner in a sophisticated paper (Teubner, 1982), which draws on Luhmann (and other authors) for the vision of a different kind of law, appropriate to the requirements of contemporary society, and in particular oriented - to use Luhmann's own terminology - more to the "steering of conduct" than to the "securing of expectations" (Luhmann, 1974). And of course I realise that Luhmann himself could all too easily dispose of my views on the matter by the (to him) simple device of addressing in a sustained fashion those aspects of this paper's topic which I maintain he has so far neglected. Be that as it may, it does seem to me that that neglect is worthy

NOTES


- (1) There are now two volumes of Luhmann's writings in English: Luhmann, 1979, 1982.
- (2) See Chapter 5 "Positive Law and Ideology", and Chapter 6, "The Autonomy of the Legal System", in Luhmann, 1982. My own introductory presentation (Poggi, 1980) is as yet unpublished.
- (3) See also Poggi, 1979, Holmes and Larmore, 1982.
- (4) Luhmann refers to writings by T.H. Marshall and Talcott Parsons as proximate sources of this concept.
- (5) See the opening remark in Holmes and Lerner, 1982:xiii.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HOLMES, Stephen, and Charles LARMORE (1982) "Translators' Introduction" to Luhmann, 1982:xiii-xxxviii.
- LUHMANN, Niklas (1969) "Funktionale Methode und juristische Entscheidung," now in Luhmann, 1981b:272-307.
- (1970a) "Zur Funktion des 'subjektiven Rechtes'," now in Luhmann, 1981b:360-373.
- (1970b) "Die Bedeutung sozialwissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse zur Organisation und Fuehrung der Verwaltung," in: Verwaltung im modernen Staat. Berlin: Senator fuer Inneres.
- (1971) Politische Planung: Aufsaetze zur Soziologie von Politik und Verwaltung. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- (1972) Rechtssoziologie. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
- (1973) Rechtssystem und Rechtsdogmatik. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- (1974) "Die Funktion des Rechts: Erwartungssicherung oder Verhaltenssteuerung?", now in Luhmann, 1981b:73-91.
- (1975a) Soziologische Aufklaerung 2: Aufsaetze zur Theorie der Gesellschaft. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- (1975b) Legitimation durch Verfahren. Neuwied: Luchterhand.
- (1979) Trust and Power. London: Wiley.
- (1981a) Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat. Muenchen: Olzog.
- (1981b) Ausdifferenzierung des Rechts: Beitraege zur Rechtssoziologie und Rechtstheorie. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- (1981c) Gesellschaftsstruktur und Semantik: Studien zur Wissenssoziologie der modernen Gesellschaft, vol. 2 Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- (1982) The Differentiation of Society. New York: Columbia University Press.
- POGGI, Gianfranco (1979) "Niklas Luhmann's Neo-Functionalist Approach: An Elementary Presentation", Introduction to Luhmann, 1979:vii-xix.
- (1980) "Two Themes from Niklas Luhmann's Contribution to

the Sociology of Law", presented at the American Sociological Association, New York, 1980 Annual Meeting.

TEUBNER, Gunther (1982) "Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law", European University Institute, Working Paper No. 14.



EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the European University Institute, Florence.

Copies can be obtained free of charge -- depending on the availability of stocks -- from:

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole(FI)
Italy

Please use order form overleaf.

To :The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole(FI)
Italy

From : Name.....
Address.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No.:.....

Author, title:.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Date:.....

Signature:

.....



PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

EUI WORKING PAPERS

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1: Jacques PELKMANS | The European Community and the Newly Industrialized Countries |
| 2: Joseph H.H. WEILER | Supranationalism Revisited - Retrospective and Prospective. The European Communities After Thirty Years |
| 3: Aldo RUSTICHINI | Seasonality in Eurodollar Interest Rates |
| 4: Mauro CAPPELLETTI/
David GOLAY | Judicial Review, Transnational and Federal: Impact on Integration |
| 5: Leonard GLESKE | The European Monetary System: Present Situation and Future Prospects |
| 6: Manfred HINZ | Massenkult und Todessymbolik in der national-sozialistischen Architektur |
| 7: Wilhelm BURKLIN | The "Greens" and the "New Politics": Goodbye to the Three-Party System? |
| 8: Athanasios MOULAKIS | Unilateralism or the Shadow of Confusion |
| 9: Manfred E. STREIT | Information Processing in Futures Markets. An Essay on the Adequacy of an Abstraction |
| 10:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI | When Workers Save and Invest: Some Kaldorian Dynamics |
| 11:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI | A Neo-Cambridge Model of Income Distribution and Unemployment |
| 12:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI/
Guglielmo CHIODI | On Lindahl's Theory of Distribution |
| 13:Gunther TEUBNER | Reflexive Rationalitaet des Rechts |
| 14:Gunther TEUBNER | Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law |
| 15:Jens ALBER | Some Causes and Consequences of Social Security Expenditure Development in Western Europe, 1949-1977 |

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 16:Ian BUDGE | Democratic Party Government: Formation and Functioning in Twenty-One Countries |
| 17:Hans DAALDER | Parties and Political Mobilization: An Initial Mapping |
| 18:Giuseppe DI PALMA | Party Government and Democratic Reproducibility: The Dilemma of New Democracies |
| 19:Richard S. KATZ | Party Government: A Rationalistic Conception |
| 20:Juerg STEINER | Decision Process and Policy Outcome: An Attempt to Conceptualize the Problem at the Cross-National Level |
| 21:Jens ALBER | The Emergence of Welfare Classes in West Germany: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Evidence |
| 22:Don PATINKIN | Paul A. Samuelson and Monetary Theory |
| 23:Marcello DE CECCO | Inflation and Structural Change in the Euro-Dollar Market |
| 24:Marcello DE CECCO | The Vicious/Virtuous Circle Debate in the '20s and the '70s |
| 25:Manfred E. STREIT | Modelling, Managing and Monitoring Futures Trading: Frontiers of Analytical Inquiry |
| 26:Domenico Mario NUTI | Economic Crisis in Eastern Europe - Prospects and Repercussions |
| 27:Terence C. DAINTITH | Legal Analysis of Economic Policy |
| 28:Frank C. CASTLES/
Peter MAIR | Left-Right Political Scales: Some Expert Judgements |
| 29:Karl HOHMANN | The Ability of German Political Parties to Resolve the Given Problems: the Situation in 1982 |
| 30:Max KAASE | The Concept of Political Culture: Its Meaning for Comparative Political Research |

- 31:Klaus TOEPFER
Possibilities and Limitations of a
Regional Economic Development Policy
in the Federal Republic of Germany
- 32:Ronald INGLEHART
The Changing Structure of Political
Cleavages Among West European Elites
and Publics
- 33:Moshe LISSAK
Boundaries and Institutional Linkages
Between Elites: Some Illustrations
from Civil-Military Elites in Israel
- 34:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI
Modern Macroeconomic Theory: An
Overview
- 35:Richard M. GOODWIN/
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI
Economic Systems and their Regulation
- 36:Maria MAGUIRE
The Growth of Income Maintenance
Expenditure in Ireland, 1951-1979
- 37:G. LOWELL FIELD/
John HIGLEY
The States of National Elites and the
Stability of Political Institutions in
81 Nations, 1950-1982
- 38:Dietrich HERZOG
New Protest Elites in the Political
System of West Berlin: The Eclipse of
Consensus?
- 39:Edward O. LAUMANN/
David KNOKE
A Framework for Concatenated Event
Analysis
- 40:Gwen MOOR/
Richard D. ALBA
Class and Prestige Origins in the
American Elite
- 41:Peter MAIR
Issue-Dimensions and Party Strategies
in the Irish republic, 1948-1981: The
Evidence of Manifestos
- 42:Joseph H.H. WEILER
Israel and the Creation of a Palestine
State. The Art of the Impossible and
the Possible
- 43:Franz Urban PAPPI
Boundary Specification and Structural
Models of Elite Systems: Social
Circles Revisited
- 44:Thomas GAWRON/
Ralf ROGOWSKI
Zur Implementation von
Gerichtsurteilen. Hypothesen zu den
Wirkungsbedingungen von Entscheidungen
des Bundesverfassungsgerichts

- 45:Alexis PAULY/
René DIEDERICH Migrant Workers and Civil Liberties
- 46:Alessandra VENTURINI Is the Bargaining Theory Still an
Effective Framework of Analysis for
Strike Patterns in Europe?
- 47:Richard A. GOODWIN Schumpeter: The Man I Knew
- 48:J.P. FITOUSSI/
Daniel SZPIRO Politique de l'Emploi et Réduction de
la Durée du Travail
- 49:Bruno DE WITTE Retour à Costa. La Primauté du Droit
Communautaire à la Lumière du Droit
International
- 50:Massimo A. BENEDETTELLI Eguaglianza e Libera Circolazione dei
Lavoratori: Principio di Eguaglianza e
Divieti di Discriminazione nella
Giurisprudenza Comunitaria in Materia
di Diritti di Mobilità Territoriale e
Professionale dei Lavoratori
- 51:Gunther TEUBNER Corporate Responsibility as a Problem
of Company Constitution
- 52:Erich SCHANZE Potentials and Limits of Economic
Analysis: The Constitution of the Firm
- 53:Maurizio COTTA Career and Recruitment Patterns of
Italian Legislators. A Contribution of
the Understanding of a Polarized
System
- 54:Mattei DOGAN How to become a Cabinet Minister in
Italy: Unwritten Rules of the
Political Game
- 55:Mariano BAENA DEL ALCAZAR/
Narciso PIZARRO The Structure of the Spanish Power
Elite 1939-1979
- 56:Berc RUSTEM/
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI Preferences in Policy Optimization and
Optimal Economic Policy
- 57:Giorgio FREDDI Bureaucratic Rationalities and the
Prospect for Party Government
- 59:Christopher Hill/
James MAYALL The Sanctions Problem: International
and European Perspectives

- 60:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI Adjusting to Competitive Depression.
The Case of the Reduction in Working
Time
- 61:Philippe LEFORT Idéologie et Morale Bourgeoise de la
Famille dans le Ménager de Paris et le
Second Libro di Famiglia, de L.B.
Alberti
- 62:Peter BROCKMEIER Die Dichter und das Kritisieren
- 63:Hans-Martin PAWLOWSKI Law and Social Conflict
- 64:Marcello DE CECCO Italian Monetary Policy in the 1980s
- 65:Gianpaolo ROSSINI Intraindustry Trade in Two Areas: Some
Aspects of Trade Within and Outside a
Custom Union
- 66:Wolfgang GEBAUER Euromarkets and Monetary Control: The
Deutschemark Case
- 67:Gerd WEINRICH On the Theory of Effective Demand
under Stochastic Rationing
- 68:Saul ESTRIN/
Derek C. JONES The Effects of Worker Participation
upon Productivity in French Producer
Cooperatives
- 69:Berc RUSTEM
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI On the Formalization of Political
Preferences: A Contribution to the
Frischian Scheme
- 70:Werner MAIHOFFER Politique et Morale
- 71:Samuel COHN Five Centuries of Dying in Siena:
Comparison with Southern France
- 72:Wolfgang GEBAUER Inflation and Interest: the Fisher
Theorem Revisited
- 73:Patrick NERHOT Rationalism and the Modern State
- 74:Philippe SCHMITTER Democratic Theory and Neo-Corporatist
Practice
- 75:Sheila A. CHAPMAN Eastern Hard Currency Debt 1970-83. An
Overview

- 76:Richard GRIFFITHS Economic Reconstruction Policy in the Netherlands and its International Consequences, May 1945 - March 1951
- 77:Scott NEWTON The 1949 Sterling Crisis and British Policy towards European Integration
- 78:Giorgio FODOR Why did Europe need a Marshall Plan in 1947?
- 79:Philippe MIOCHE The Origins of the Monnet Plan: How a Transitory Experiment answered to Deep-Rooted Needs
- 80:Werner ABELSHAUSER The Economic Policy of Ludwig Erhard
- 81:Helge PHARO The Domestic and International Implications of Norwegian Reconstruction
- 82:Heiner R. ADAMSEN Investitionspolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1951
- 83:Jean BOUVIER Le Plan Monnet et l'Economie Française 1947-1952
- 84:Mariuccia SALVATI Industrial and Economic Policy in the Italian Reconstruction
- 85:William DIEBOLD, Jr. Trade and Payments in Western Europe in Historical Perspective: A Personal View By an Interested Party
- 86:Frances LYNCH French Reconstruction in a European Context
- 87:Gunther TEUBNER Verrechtlichung. Begriffe, Merkmale, Grenzen, Auswege
- 88:Maria SPINEDI Les Crimes Internationaux de l'Etat dans les Travaux de Codification de la Responsabilité des Etats Entrepris par les Nations Unies
- 89:Jelle VISSER Dimensions of Union Growth in Postwar Western Europe
- 90:Will BARTLETT Unemployment, Migration and Industrialization in Yugoslavia, 1958-1977

- | | |
|--|--|
| 91:Wolfgang GEBAUER | Kondratieff's Long Waves |
| 92:Elisabeth DE GHELLINCK/
Paul A. GEROSKI/
Alexis JACQUEMIN | Inter-Industry and Inter-Temporal
Variations in the Effect of Trade on
Industry Performance |
| 93:Gunther TEUBNER/
Helmut WILLKE | Kontext und Autonomie.
Gesellschaftliche Selbststeuerung
durch Reflexives Recht |
| 94:Wolfgang STREECK/
Philippe C. SCHMITTER | Community, Market, State- and
Associations. The Prospective
Contribution of Interest Governance
to Social Order |
| 95:Nigel GRIFFIN | "Virtue Versus Letters": The Society
of Jesus 1550-1580 and the Export of
an Idea |
| 96:Andreas KUNZ | Arbeitsbeziehungen und
Arbeitskonflikte im oeffentlichen
Sektor. Deutschland und
Grossbritannien im Vergleich 1914-1924 |
| 97:Wolfgang STREECK | Neo-Corporatist Industrial Relations
and the Economic Crisis in West
Germany |
| 98:Simon A. HORNER | The Isle of Man and the Channel
Islands - A Study of their Status
under Constitutional, International
and European Law |
| 99:Daniel ROCHE | Le Monde des Ombres |
| 84/100:Gunther TEUBNER | After Legal Instrumentalism? |
| 84/101:Patrick NERHOT | Contribution aux Débats sur le Droit
Subjectif et le Droit Objectif comme
Sources du Droit |
| 84/102:Jelle VISSER | The Position of Central Confederations
in the National Union Movements |
| 84/103:Marcello DE CECCO | The International Debt Problem in the
Inter-War Period |
| 84/104:M. Rainer LEPSIUS | Sociology in Germany and Austria 1918-
1945. The Emigration of the Social
Sciences and its Consequences. The |

- | | |
|--|--|
| | Development of Sociology in Germany
after the Second World War, 1945-1967 |
| 84/105:Derek JONES | The Economic Performances of Producer
Cooperations within Command Economies:
Evidence for the Case of Poland |
| 84/106:Philippe C. SCHMITTER | Neo-Corporatism and the State |
| 84/107:Marcos BUSER | Der Einfluss der Wirtschaftsverbaende
auf Gesetzgebungsprozesse und das
Vollzugswesen im Bereich des
Umweltschutzes |
| 84/108:Frans van WAARDEN | Bureaucracy around the State:Varieties
of Collective Self-Regulation in the
Dutch Dairy Industry |
| 84/109:Ruggero RANIERI | The Italian Iron and Steel Industry
and European Integration |
| 84/110:Peter FARAGO | Nachfragemacht und die kollektiven
Reaktionen der Nahrungsmittelindustrie |
| 84/111:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI/
Kumuraswamy VELUPILLAI | A Non-Linear Model of Fluctuations in
Output in a Mixed Economy |
| 84/112:Anna Elisabetta GALEOTTI | Individualism and Political Theory |
| 84/113:Domenico Mario NUTI | Mergers and Disequilibrium in Labour-
Managed Economies |
| 84/114:Saul ESTRIN/Jan SVEJNAR | Explanations of Earnings in
Yugoslavia: The Capital and Labor
Schools Compared |
| 84/115:Alan CAWSON/John BALLARD | A Bibliography of Corporatism |
| 84/116:Reinhard JOHN | On the Weak Axiom of Revealed
Preference Without Demand Continuity
Assumptions |
| 84/117:Richard T.GRIFFITHS/Frances
M.B. LYNCH | The FRITALUX/FINEBEL Negotiations
1949/1950 |
| 84/118:Pierre DEHEZ | Monopolistic Equilibrium and
Involuntary Unemployment |
| 84/119:Domenico Mario NUTI | Economic and Financial Evaluation of
Investment Projects; General
Principles and E.C. Procedures |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 84/120:Marcello DE CECCO | Monetary Theory and Roman History |
| 84/121:Marcello DE CECCO | International and Transnational Financial Relations |
| 84/122:Marcello DE CECCO | Modes of Financial Development: American Banking Dynamics and World Financial Crises |
| 84/123:Lionello F. PUNZO/
Kumuraswamy VELUPILLAI | Multisectoral Models and Joint Production |
| 84/124:John FARQUHARSON | The Management of Agriculture and Food Supplies in Germany, 1944-47 |
| 84/125:Ian HARDEN/Norman LEWIS | De-Legalisation in Britain in the 1980s |
| 84/126:John CABLE | Employee Participation and Firm Performance. A Prisoners' Dilemma Framework |
| 84/127:Jesper JESPERSEN | Financial Model Building and Financial Multipliers of the Danish Economy |
| 84/128:Ugo PAGANO | Welfare, Productivity and Self-Management |
| 84/129:Maureen CAIN | Beyond Informal Justice |
| 85/130:Otfried HOEFFE | Political Justice - Outline of a Philosophical Theory |
| 85/131:Stuart J. WOOLF | Charity and Family Subsistence: Florence in the Early Nineteenth Century |
| 85/132:Massimo MARCOLIN | The <u>Casa d'Industria</u> in Bologna during the Napoleonic Period: Public Relief and Subsistence Strategies |
| 85/133:Osvaldo RAGGIO | Strutture di parentela e controllo delle risorse in un'area di transito: la Val Fontanabuona tra Cinque e Seicento |
| 85/134:Renzo SABBATINI | Work and Family in a Lucchese Paper-Making Village at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century |

- 85/135: Sabine JURATIC
Solitude féminine et travail des femmes à Paris à la fin du XVIIIème siècle
- 85/136: Laurence FONTAINE
Les effets déséquilibrants du colportage sur les structures de famille et les pratiques économiques dans la vallée de l'Oisans, 18e-19e siècles
- 85/137: Christopher JOHNSON
Artisans vs. Fabricants: Urban Protoindustrialisation and the Evolution of Work Culture in Lodève and Bédarieux, 1740-1830
- 85/138: Daniela LOMBARDI
La demande d'assistance et les réponses des autorités urbaines face à une crise conjoncturelle: Florence 1619-1622
- 85/139: Orstrom MOLLER
Financing European Integration: The European Communities and the Proposed European Union.
- 85/140: John PINDER
Economic and Social Powers of the European Union and the Member States: Subordinate or Coordinate Relationship
- 85/141: Vlad CONSTANTINESCO
La Repartition des Competences Entre l'Union et les Etats Membres dans le Projet de Traite' Instituant l'Union Europeenne.
- 85/142: Peter BRUECKNER
Foreign Affairs Power and Policy in the Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union.
- 85/143: Jan DE MEYER
Belgium and the Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union.
- 85/144: Per LACHMANN
The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union: Constitutional and Political Implications in Denmark.
- 85/145: Thijmen KOOPMANS
The Judicial System Envisaged in the Draft Treaty.
- 85/146: John TEMPLE-LANG
The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union and the Member

- | | |
|--|---|
| | States: Ireland |
| 85/147:Carl Otto LENZ | The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union: Report on the Federal Republic of Germany |
| 85/148:David EDWARD/
Richard MCALLISTER/
Robert LANE | The Draft Treaty establishing the European Union: Report on the United Kingdom |
| 85/149:Joseph J. M. VAN DER VEN | Les droits de l'Homme: leur universalite' en face de la diversite' des civilisations. |
| 85/150:Ralf ROGOWSKI | Meso-Corporatism and Labour Conflict Resolution |
| 85/151:Jacques GENTON | Problemes Constitutionnels et Politiques poses en France par une eventuelle ratification et mise en oeuvre du projet de Traite d'Union Europeenne |
| 85/152:Marjanne de KWAASTENIET | Education as a verzuiling phenomenon Public and independent education in the Netherlands |
| 85/153:Gianfranco PASQUINO
and Luciano BARDI | The Institutions and the Process of Decision-Making in the Draft Treaty |
| 85/154:Joseph WEILER
and James MODRALL | The Creation of the Union and Its Relation to the EC Treaties |
| 85/155:François DUCHENE | Beyond the first C.A.P. |
| 85/156:Domenico Mario NUTI | Political and Economic Fluctuations in the Socialist System |
| 85/157:Gianfranco POGGI | Niklas Luhmann on the Welfare State and its Law |
| 85/158:Christophe DEISSENBERG | On the Determination of Macroeconomic Policies with Robust Outcome |
| 85/159:Pier Paolo D'ATTORRE | ERP Aid and the Problems of Productivity in Italy during the 1950s |
| 85/160:Hans-Georg DEGGAU | Ueber einige Voraussetzungen und Folgen der Verrechtlichung |

